

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4 - 17 are pending in the present application. Claim 3 was previously canceled. Claims 11 - 17 are newly added.

Concurrently with the submission of the present document, Applicant is submitting an IDS with a PTO-1449 and reference. Applicant respectfully requests that with the next Office communication, the Examiner include **a copy of the PTO-1449** acknowledging that the Office considered the reference.

Applicant notes with appreciation that the Examiner has allowed claim 7. For clarity, Applicant amended claim 7 to introduce terms with the indefinite article "a", rather than with the phrase "at least one of." Applicant does not believe this amendment effects the scope of claim 7, and accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a reaffirmation of the allowance of claim 7.

In section 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4 - 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Publication No. 2001-326419 to Naoki (hereinafter "the Naoki publication") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,647,184 to Ukechi et al. (hereinafter "the Ukechi et al. patent"). Of this set of rejected claims, one is independent, namely claim 1. Applicant amended claim 1 to include an allowable recital that was previously presented in claim 7.

Claim 1 provides for an optoelectronic assembly. The optoelectronic assembly includes, *inter alia*, an optical light guide that includes a structural feature to facilitate interception of light from a main optical path.

Applicant submits that the Naoki publication and the Ukechi et al. patent, whether considered independently or in combination with one another, neither disclose nor suggest an optical light guide that includes a structural feature to facilitate interception of light from a main optical path, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant also submits

that claim 1 is patentable over the cited combination of the Naoki publication and the Ukechi et al. patent.

Claims 2, 4 – 6 and 10 depend from claim 1. By virtue of this dependence, claims 2, 4 – 6 and 10 are also patentable over the cited combination of references.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 2, 4 – 6 and 10.

In section 4 of the Office Action, claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Naoki publication and the Ukechi et al. patent, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,486 to Jiang et al. (hereinafter "the Jiang et al. patent"). Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 1. The Jiang et al. patent does not make up for the deficiencies of the Naoki publication and the Ukechi patent, as they relate to claim 1, and so, Applicant submits that claim 1, as well as claims 8 and 9, are all patentable over the cited combination of the Naoki publication, and the Ukechi et al. and Jiang et al. patents.

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejection of claims 8 and 9.

As mentioned above, Applicant amended claim 7 to introduce terms with the indefinite article "a", rather than with the phrase "at least one of", and amended claim 1 to include a recital that was previously presented in claim 7. Applicant also amended claim 1 to introduce terms with the indefinite article "a", rather than with the phrase "at least one of", and amended claims 2, 4 – 6, 8 and 10 to one or more of (a) provide consistency with claim 1, (b) improve grammar, (c) properly introduce a term, or (d) avoid a recitation of "means for."

Applicant added claims 11 - 17 to even further provide the claim coverage that Applicant appears to deserve based on the prior art that was cited by the Examiner.


Whereas all of claims 11 – 17 depend from the allowed claim 7, a favorable consideration that also results in the allowance of claims 11 - 17 is earnestly solicited.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims presented in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

8/18/05

Date



Paul D. Greeley, Esq.
Reg. No. 31,019
Attorney for the Applicant
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
Tel: 203-327-4500
Fax: 203-327-6401